

Appl. No. : 10/706,816  
Filed : November 12, 2003

### REMARKS

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to clarify the invention. Support can be found in Figs. 3 and 4, for example. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

#### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goeden in view of Mizuno and in view of Moore. Claims 1 and 6 are independent and have been amended to clarify the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In Claim 1 as amended herein, (i) the upper and lower side edges are fixedly hemmed, (ii) the nonelastic edge cords movably pass through each of meshes that are aligned along each of the right and left side edges, and (iii) the edge cord length adjustment devices are capable of adjusting the length between the upper and lower of the respective nonelastic edge cords, independently of each other.

Goeden teaches none of (i)-(iii). With regard to (ii), because Goeden uses loop fasteners (14a), the cord (13) cannot movably pass through each of meshes that are aligned along the right, left, and lower side edges. In contrast, in claim 1, the cords movably pass through each of meshes that are aligned along both the right and left side edges.

Mizuno teaches hems (14, 15) along the upper and lower side edges. However, Mizuno teaches neither (ii) nor (iii).

Moore teaches none of (i)-(iii). The cords in Moore are elastic. With regard to (iii), Moore uses the spacer (66). However, the spacer (66) is not capable of adjusting the length between the upper and lower of the nonelastic edge cords, independently of each other.

In view of the above, none of Goeden, Mizuno, and Moore teaches or suggests at least (ii) and (iii). “To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.” (M.P.E.P. § 2143.03) Thus, claim 1 could not be obvious over the references, and at least for this reason, the remaining dependent claims also could not be obvious.

Appl. No. : 10/706,816  
Filed : November 12, 2003

Claim 6 recites the same limitations as claim 1 discussed above, and thus, at least for the same reason, claim 6 and its dependent claim also could not be obvious over the references.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the Applicant's amendments to the claims and the foregoing Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: March 29, 2006

By:



Katsuhiro Arai  
Registration No. 43,315  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(949) 760-0404

2483443  
032906